JAMES H. MEYER ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW
WITH
LAWRENCE J. ANDREWS

September 25, and
October 6, 1992

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

James H. Meyer Oral History Project
University of California, Davis

Oral History Interview

with

LAWRENCE J. ANDREWS

Dean, College of Letters and Science
1964-1985

September 25 and October 6, 1992
Chemistry Annex
University of California, Davis

By Susan E. Douglass
California State University, Sacramento

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616

PREFACE

The James H. Meyer Oral History Project was planned to provide the University of California, Davis with a history of the changes in the campus under Chancellor James H. Meyer's leadership from the early 1960s through the mid-1980s. In the fall of 1991, John Skarstad, Acting Head of the Department of Special Collections of the General Library, contacted Dr. Jacqueline S. Reinier, Director of the Oral History Program, Center for California Studies at California State University, Sacramento to begin the project. Dr. Reinier hired Susan Douglass, a Research Associate and graduate student in the Capital Campus Public History Program at CSUS, to conduct interviews with Chancellor Emeritus Meyer and individuals involved in the administration of the campus.

Douglass conducted research in written records and worked closely with John Skarstad to develop interview topics. As the project progressed, Skarstad and Douglass decided a more complete picture of the history of UCD could be obtained by including a brief discussion of the narrators' full career in addition to the core discussion topics.

Each interviewee completed a biographical questionnaire. Interviewees were given the opportunity to review their typed transcripts, and final transcripts were edited by Douglass before binding.

The original tapes, copies of the bound transcripts and production materials are located in the Department of Special Collections in the General Library at the University of California, Davis. In addition, copies of the tapes and transcripts, as well as the working transcripts, are located in the Oral History Collection in the University Archives, The Library, California State University, Sacramento.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY ii

SESSION 1, September 25, 1992

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

Getting hired as an instructor and junior chemist at UC Davis--Responsibilities and activities--Living in Davis--A typical work day--Campus atmosphere--Impact of the formation of the College of Letters and Science--Becoming Department of Chemistry chair--Being appointed acting dean of the College of Letters and Science.

[Tape 1, Side B] 18

Activities while acting dean--Becoming dean of College of Letters and Science--Relationship between Dean Herbert Young, College of Letters and Science, and Chancellor Emil Mrak--Dealing with faculty allocations and recruitment--Working with Chancellor Mrak and his administration--A typical work day--Likes and dislikes of the position--Differences in administrative styles of Chancellor Mrak and Chancellor James H. Meyer.

SESSION 2, October 6, 1992

[Tape 2, Side A] 35

Stepping down as acting dean--Reasons for becoming dean--Working with faculty on teaching quality and recruitment--Working with Chancellor Meyer and his administration regarding faculty positions--Dr. Mrak's effectiveness as chancellor--Chancellor Meyer's management style--Fall conferences--Impact of student activism on the College of Letters and Science--Governor Ronald Reagan's impact--Development of the Black Studies program.

[Tape 2, Side B] 54

Development of Black Studies and Chicano Studies--Evolution of students and dealing with the changes--Undergraduate program development--Role as dean, and likes and dislikes about the position--Observations regarding Dr. Meyer as chancellor--Reasons for leaving position as dean--Additional activities as dean.

[Tape 3, Side A] 72

Additional activities as dean--Major achievements as dean--growth of College of Letters and Science--Difficulties in developing Black Studies and Chicano Studies--Reasons for development of ethnic studies programs --Affirmative action--ROTC program and student activism--Reaction to student activism--Working for Chancellor Meyer--Impact of growth.

[Tape 3, Side B] 89

Impact of growth and reasons for UC Davis' popularity--Unexpected aspects of position as dean.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

These interview sessions with Lawrence J. Andrews, the former dean of the College of Letters and Science from 1964 until 1985, are the second in a series of interviews that will compose the James H. Meyer Oral History Project and provide a history of the University of California, Davis. The focus of this project is major themes in the development, expansion, and organization of campus programs under Chancellor Meyer's leadership. In addition to focusing on the period of Dr. Meyer's chancellorship, 1969-1987, these interview sessions with Dr. Andrews include his experiences at UC Davis from the time he arrived in the 1940s through the 1960s.

The interviewer, Susan Douglass, met with Dr. Andrews for a preliminary interview to discuss the project. After the interviews, Dr. Andrews reviewed the transcript making some minor changes, largely to clarify information. He did not make any major changes in the content of the transcript.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

Lawrence J. Andrews was born in 1920 in San Diego, California. He received his primary education in San Diego, Long Beach and San Francisco. After graduating from Long Beach Polytechnic High School, Andrews attended the University of California, Berkeley where he received a B.S. in chemistry in 1940. At the University of California, Los Angeles he continued his studies in chemistry, completing an M.A. and Ph.D. by 1943.

Before arriving at the University of California, Davis in 1945 as an instructor and junior chemist, Andrews worked as a lecturer in chemistry at UCLA and as a senior chemist for the Tennessee Eastman Corporation, which at the time was conducting work for the Manhattan District Project in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. At UCD, Andrews taught in the Department of Chemistry and was a chemist in the Agricultural Experiment Station. From 1962 until 1963 he served as acting dean of the College of Letters and Science while Dean Herbert Young was on sabbatical. Andrews became dean of the college in 1964 and served in that capacity until he retired in 1985 at which time he returned to teaching.

During his career, Andrews was a Ford Foundation Fellow at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, 1953-1954, as well as a Fulbright Senior Research Fellow at University of Hull in England, 1967-1968. He also was a coauthor with Dr. Raymond M. Keefer of Molecular Complexes in Organic Chemistry published in 1973. In his honor, UCD established the Lawrence J. Andrews Prize Fund for outstanding undergraduates in 1985.

[Session 1, September 25, 1992]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

DOUGLASS: I thought we could start with when you first came to Davis, UC Davis, [University of California, Davis] which was in 1945.

ANDREWS: That's right.

DOUGLASS: You were first hired as an instructor and a junior chemist, is that correct?

ANDREWS: That's right.

DOUGLASS: How did that happen?

ANDREWS: Well, when I finished my graduate work at UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles], I stayed on as a post-doctoral fellow for about six months, I guess it was. And then I was employed by Tennessee Eastman Corporation in Oak Ridge which was part of the Manhattan [District] Project. At that time, as far as Tennessee Eastman is concerned, they were working on the production of

uranium 235. Now I got married just before I went to Oak Ridge, and when I was going back there, the man for whom my wife worked at the time at UCLA and his niece who had also hired Betty [Elizabeth Heggelund Andrews] when she was a student at Los Angeles City College said, "When you go back there if you see my cousin," or uncle as the case may be, "Herbert [A.] Young, give him our best regards." Well, I ended up in Oak Ridge, and I found out that there were 70,000 people there. So I figured that my chances of ever meeting Herbert Young were zero.

DOUGLASS: Now Herbert Young was with UC Davis . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Yes.

DOUGLASS: . . . at that time.

ANDREWS: . . . Yes.

DOUGLASS: And what was his position?

ANDREWS: He was chairman of the chemistry division in the College of Agriculture, which is what Davis was in those days.

DOUGLASS: Right.

ANDREWS: Well, unbeknownst to me, he was the head of the Chemistry Research and Development Division at Tennessee Eastman. Now I had spent the first three weeks in what they call the bullpen waiting

for security clearance. That meant waiting while they sent scouts out around here and there to do interviews to find out about your reliability as a good faithful American citizen. Well, one Friday night about 4:00 [P.M.] they told me, "OK, you can report for work and you're to report to Herbert Young." Somewhere along the line he called me into his office one day and he said one of the Davis faculty who left for war work was not going to come back when the campus reopened in the fall of 1945 and would I like a faculty appointment at Davis. I'd always liked Davis and I said, "Sure." He said, "No, you go talk to your wife first." And I said, "She won't care." [Laughter] Well, anyway, we showed up here in October of 1945.

DOUGLASS: You just said that you always liked Davis.

ANDREWS: Well, I had seen it when I was a student at Berkeley [University of California, Berkeley] and prior to that because my aunt and uncle in San Francisco on occasion would take me on a summer trip up to Trinity County. They had access to a cabin up there and we used to go through Davis. And I thought, "What a pretty town." After having lived for a long time in Southern California, I began to yearn for a place where they had trees other than palm trees. [Laughter]

Davis was so pretty because, while it wasn't very big, there were trees all over the place. And they weren't palm trees.

Well, anyway, the campus reopened to undergraduate instruction, I think, in November of that year. They were giving the people who'd been in the military a chance to reassemble, and the faculty too. There had been some activity on the campus during the war, but most of the chemistry operation was totally shut down because the building was taken over as a training center for the [U.S. Army] Signal Corps. They did continue to do some of the pre-Oak Ridge work on uranium chemistry for a while, but finally it just all packed up and moved to Oak Ridge. The campus had an undergraduate enrollment that fall of just a few hundred--I want to say four hundred but I'm not sure I'm right--and the returning students, most of them, were just about my age.

DOUGLASS: Really.

ANDREWS: Yes. So we made friends with a lot of the students, not so much with the faculty around the campus because. . . . Well, I was just twenty-five at that time and they thought I was a little kid . . . [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

ANDREWS: . . . And treated me accordingly, which I deeply resented--not all of them, God knows. There were some very fine people.

DOUGLASS: What is foremost in your memory when you look back and you first arrived at the campus?

ANDREWS: I think my foremost memory was being so darn glad to be out of prison, which is what I felt like when I was in Oak Ridge. And also the opportunity to get back to things that I liked, teaching and research. Fortunately, the burden of teaching wasn't great. There was plenty of opportunity, however, to get to know the students and for me to hone my skills as a teacher. I had a great deal of time for research. At that time we didn't have any graduate students. We did it all with our own hands, which I never minded. I kept right on at it until the time I retired, not while I was in the dean's office, that was virtually impossible except for an occasional flurry during the summer.

DOUGLASS: Who did you work with those first few years?

ANDREWS: Here? Well, sometimes I worked by myself. I did some research with [Richard Edwin] Dick Kepner who was on the faculty here by that time. He had been a fellow graduate student at UCLA. Subsequent to that I started doing work with [Raymond] Ray Keefer

and we continued right through the years. And it was very. . . . Well, I guess I'd say it was a very rewarding experience. We were quite productive for our time, not by today's standards. We had a lot of fun. Published quite a few papers.

DOUGLASS: You just said you were not productive compared to today's standards. What did you mean by that?

ANDREWS: Well, today the typical faculty member has quite a few graduate students who--I don't mean this unkindly at all--but they serve as a pair of hands and each one is a pair of hands to do research. So they build up much bigger publication vitaes. They are, however, the victims of the game called grantsmanship. It's become sort of an obsession that in order to be a good faculty member you have to have a lot of grants and do a lot of research, which is unfortunate. It's recognized as being unfortunate in university circles, but it just keeps right on going.

DOUGLASS: In the early period, then, you were working more with students?

ANDREWS: Yes. We did start our own Ph.D. program. It was in the late forties, I guess. It was in collaboration with the department at Berkeley. Students did there research here, took some of their courses here, took some at Berkeley, took their qualifying exams at Berkeley, got

their degrees from Berkeley. That lasted a few years and then we had our own Ph.D. program here on the campus.

DOUGLASS: When was that, do you remember?

ANDREWS: No, I don't remember the exact year.[1]

DOUGLASS: I can check on that.

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: That's not critical right now.

ANDREWS: No, I'm sorry, I don't. I would think . . .

DOUGLASS: Was it the early fifties?

ANDREWS: I would guess the early fifties.

I should say that when we came here Davis was a small town, had less than two thousand people. You got to know most everybody, which was fun. There were a few maddening experiences because the town was sort of a closed corporation. If you weren't an old-timer, you didn't get the preferential treatment that you would as a newcomer.

DOUGLASS: Can you give me a specific example?

ANDREWS: Yes. I remember one day going into a grocery store. This was right after the war with some things in the grocery line being scarce. And

---

[1]Authorization for the Ph.D. in chemistry occurred in 1956.

I said, "Do you, by chance, have a pound of butter?" The grocer, not just the clerk, it was the owner, he said, "No. We're all out of butter." Then what was obviously an old established customer came in and she said, "I'd like a pound of butter please." He reached under the counter and [Andrew's slams his hand on the table] put it down right in front of me. That was the end of that store. [Laughter]

And I remember when we came here we moved in. . . . Herb Young had gotten two houses which he had rented for people at Oak Ridge returning here, the Andrews and the [Dinsmoor] Webbs. We moved into one of the houses which was a pleasant little house that's near the corner of Fifth and G streets which is now an insurance office. We were told that the owners had moved to farm property outside Davis and would not return; we could have the place as long as we wanted. And then it turned out about the time we had a six-month-old baby that they decided they were moving back in. Well, housing was very precious in those days because the faculty was building up in size and the town had limited space. I was desperate and I called a woman who owned a group of little cabin type accommodations down somewhere around the railroad track because

I heard she had a vacancy. She said, "Well," and then she said, "I'm sorry but I just rent my places to Davis boys and girls." And I said, "Well, I have a six month old Davis girl." Well, that doesn't count. We were in desperation and going to have to look for some place out of town, which was hard in those days because we didn't have a car for one thing. In the meantime my sister-in-law had come up here from Los Angeles and gotten a job in [agricultural] ag engineering as a secretary. She had moved in with a medical assistant at one of the doctors' offices. They had a flat on B Street--one bedroom, pull down bed in the living room--and they took us in. We were there for about six months. And I'd sit around watching three women putting up their hair in curlers at night, feeling kind of out of it because [Laughter] I didn't have any hair to put up for one thing. They gave us the bedroom and they pulled down the bed in the living room. It was very, very kind of them.

DOUGLASS: You mentioned some of the things that you did in those early years with your position, but what was a typical day like for you?

ANDREWS: I probably had teaching responsibilities no more than three days a week. I used to hope that they'd be early in the morning so I'd have the rest of the day for research. For the first year or so it didn't work

out that way because we had no TA's [Teaching Assistants] and so I was assigned to teach freshman lab sections, which was fine but that took up good parts of afternoons. But that shifted shortly so that I had classes in which I lectured--not large classes like they are now--and I had most of the day for research or library work, or what have you. I can't think of anything else because that was the way my days were then. I had, of course, no administrative responsibility.

DOUGLASS: In those early years what was the atmosphere of the campus like?

ANDREWS: Very informal, which I liked. We did wear coats and ties which you don't see much of these days. But everybody knew each other. Once the barrier of being a little kid was broken down, it turned out to be a very friendly place. It gave me quite a different feeling from the one I experienced when I was a student at Berkeley which always seemed like a very formidable place to me. UCLA was something different. I enjoyed that. But it was in a big city whereas this was a little farm town and I just enjoyed those close relationships that the small size of the campus provided. I think to some extent that atmosphere has survived over the years even though the place has gotten very big. I don't know whether its tradition or what, but it is a much more friendly campus for, I think, students and

faculty than either Berkeley or UCLA just because of where they are. They're in the big city and they have a lot of commuting students who don't have any particular affection for the campuses. They go home at night. I'm not saying I didn't love UCLA as a graduate student, I did. But this place just had something, I can't put my finger on it, that the other places didn't. Now I can't make comparisons with any other of the UC [University of California] universities because I'm not that well acquainted. Santa Cruz [University of California, Santa Cruz], a little bit because one of my daughters went there. But that seems like a totally different world to me. I don't know anything about it. The campus always seemed absolutely gorgeous but sort of out of place in this grove of Redwood trees by the ocean.

DOUGLASS: You mentioned Herbert Young, that he was the reason why you came here. What interaction did you have with him once you came to the campus?

ANDREWS: Constant. My office was right next to his. Faculty--there were five of us at that time--got together every morning and every afternoon for coffee. It was a very, very tight circle of faculty. After all, you only had five people. They damn well better get along with each

other [Laughter] and have close relationships. And it was that way.

DOUGLASS: You were here when the first class graduated from the campus. Is that correct? In terms of students with the formal four-year degree.

ANDREWS: Yes. I don't particularly remember that graduation, but I was here and I used to go to all of them. They were again quite informal. They were held out on the street just north of Shield's Library. In those days, of course, that building was both administration building and library. The library was on the second story and the administrative offices were on the first. They had bleachers up there for the spectators. There was just a small group of students graduating in those years so they sat just in chairs on the street. It was all very pleasant.

DOUGLASS: Letters and Science became formalized in 1951. How did that affect you or impact you?

ANDREWS: Well, we lost the department chairman, Herb, to the deanship. He spent pretty much full-time on it. I think he might have taught one course a year, but he had the job of going out and recruiting department chairs, building up departments that didn't exist. The basic structure already existed on the campus to build a College of Letters and Science because even though the students were all

agriculture students they had what I guess we would call now general education requirements that they had to complete. There were courses in English, courses in history and political science, and others that don't come to mind now. I don't think there was an [economics] econ group then but I may be wrong.

DOUGLASS: Did the formalization affect your position specifically in what you were doing?

ANDREWS: Well, I became a member of the College of Letters and Science. They continued us on eleven-month appointments even though the typical appointment in Letters and Science is a nine-month appointment, but the old-timers who were within the College of Agriculture had eleven-month appointments and they just stayed.

Oh, I should mention also that the science departments--chemistry, physics, math, and several biological sciences--all had structures that were already there. Obviously the [agriculture] ag students had to take chemistry and some of them physics and almost all of them the biological sciences.

For me it was just more or less keeping on doing the same thing except developing new courses that hadn't been taught before because we now had a major.

DOUGLASS: What did that involve for you?

ANDREWS: I developed a course in organic chemistry for chemistry majors which was patterned after a comparable course given at Berkeley. And I started out, I think, with five students. Now that course. . . . Well, the structure is being changed so I can't comment right now on how many students are in what would be the comparable course, but at least up to two or three, four, years ago--or going back that far--there were, oh, four hundred plus students in the course at times and it was offered more than one quarter a year.

DOUGLASS: Did you develop other courses?

ANDREWS: Yes. I gave a course in physical organic chemistry for graduate students. I sometimes taught--this was not a new course--Chemistry 8 which was the course in organic chemistry taken by mostly agriculture students. Sometimes--and this is before the new course I was talking about was introduced--I taught the laboratory portion of organic chemistry which was designed for ag students. When we put in the new course for chemistry majors, it had a lab type tied right to it, so it was a completely separate activity.

DOUGLASS: How was program development initiated? Did it come from the department chair or did you suggest new courses?

ANDREWS: I think we worked together as a group. I really don't remember. We knew what was required for the chemistry major and by that time we had enough people to do the job. The faculty was increasing by maybe one a year every year for quite a long period. Of course, now it's up to, I don't know, somewhere between thirty-five or forty faculty I would guess. I'm just not quite sure.

DOUGLASS: Moving through the fifties, when the campus was getting larger, what stands out in your memory of those years?

ANDREWS: I think the thing that I remember the most stems from the time I became dean which was in the sixties, just an awareness of the increasing size of the campus, the addition of new departments that hadn't existed before, the change in the nature of the typical student. In other words, there was a much broader breadth of interest on the part of the students so you couldn't tell by looking at them whether they were ag students or [Letters and Science] L and S students, and if they were L and S students what their majors were.

DOUGLASS: What did you think of those changes?

ANDREWS: I liked it. It gave the campus a breadth that it didn't have before. It was fine, a most enjoyable period. In many ways the best time I was here.

DOUGLASS: Why do you say that?

ANDREWS: I had so much more freedom than I did in later years. See, in 1957 I finally got promoted to full professor, and then in 1959 I was appointed department chairman at which time we had about thirteen faculty, as I recall. It gave me a different perspective on what being a faculty member was like because I had to begin worrying about budget and respond to the request of individual faculty for funds.

DOUGLASS: This was when you were department chair?

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: How did you become department chair?

ANDREWS: The dean appointed me. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: That simple. [Laughter]

ANDREWS: Yes. I said, "OK."

Well, that lasted three years and then the dean went off on sabbatical so I was appointed acting dean.

DOUGLASS: How did that happen?

ANDREWS: I guess Herb Young said he would like to have me move in to take his place for a year. I think when he got back he wasn't totally happy with everything I'd done. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Why do you say that?

ANDREWS: Oh, I had helped to get rid of a few faculty that I thought were not up to snuff and he wasn't in agreement. However, that was not a major issue.

DOUGLASS: Were there any other things that you felt he did not agree with?

ANDREWS: Well, I remember one time when I was chairman I was still pretty bratty, if you will pardon the expression, and while I had to worry about budget, I didn't worry about the day-by-day supply of money. And one day, Agnes [Rudser Ring] who was the secretary of the department, a long time fixture, and a tough customer. . . . I could tell you some funny stories about her, but I don't think it's appropriate. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Maybe we can come back to that if that seems appropriate.

ANDREWS: Anyway, Agnes came in one day and she said, "Well, we're out of money," because she kept the books by writing the figure of how much money we started with and then writing in each item of expenditure and subtracting as she went along. So the money supply just kept on going down until Agnes decided there wasn't any left. And this was just between semesters, half-way through the academic year. So I called the dean and I said, "We're out of money. We don't even have money to buy sulfuric acid for the freshman

laboratory." I said to him, "Can I hit you up for $10,000?" And he said, "No. I can't let you have it." I said, "Fine. We'll just drop Chem 1B for the next semester," [Laughter] and hung up. Well, I got the $10,000 the next day, but he didn't speak to me for three months. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

DOUGLASS: You were talking about some things that you did that you didn't think Herbert Young may have agreed with while he was gone and you were acting dean.

ANDREWS: Right. Anyway, Herb came back from. . . . He'd been, I think, a Fulbright fellow in Pakistan. I went back to chemistry without being chairman and I was very happy. But, Herb had developed cancer while in Pakistan and had put off having anything done about it until he got back because I think he had a fear of having anything done over there by doctors that he thought might not be competent. I don't know. But anyway, he didn't have anything done about it. He was pretty sick and he got sicker. It pretty soon became clear that he wasn't going to make it and he wasn't able to function effectively as

the dean, which was a very tragic thing because he was a young man, fifty-seven, fifty-eight, something like that. And the chancellor finally--that was Emil Mrak--talked to him and convinced him that he couldn't continue on with the job. And he couldn't. The responsibility was being put on an associate dean who just couldn't handle it. I remember one time the head staff person in the office called me and said, "Can you come over and help straighten out this budget mess. Because," she said, "so-and-so isn't able to cope with it." So I did. But anyway, Herb stepped down as dean and the chancellor appointed me as the dean.

DOUGLASS: Since you had been acting dean it seemed logical for you to go into the position?

ANDREWS: Yes. I guess that was the rationale. And I got along fine with the chancellor. Well, I won't tell you about that. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] You just made the comment that you got along with the chancellor. Does that mean that Herbert Young didn't get along with him?

ANDREWS: I think their relationships were not good.

DOUGLASS: Why do you think that?

ANDREWS: Well, I don't know whether I should tell stories out of turn.

DOUGLASS: No, your impressions are legitimate.

ANDREWS: I think Herb was a very gentlemanly man and Emil Mrak was kind of a bombastic person, well-meaning but, you know, if he didn't like something you did, he'd yell at you just to see whether you'd back down. That was not Herb's style at all. And, furthermore, I think Herb had aspirations of being appointed chancellor and didn't get the job, which . . .

DOUGLASS: You're talking about when Emil Mrak became the official chancellor after [Stanley B.] Freeborn.

ANDREWS: Yes. Right. Freeborn didn't stay in the job very long.

DOUGLASS: Right.

ANDREWS: Herb didn't get along at all with Freeborn either, but on the other hand Herb was. . . . Well, the reason the College of Letters and Science was created, I think, was because Herb thought there ought to be one. He was on very good terms with Claude Hutchison, who was the dean of agriculture and overall head of the campus before it broadened out in scope. And I think Hutchison backed him all the way. There wouldn't be any college if it weren't for Herb. Or it wouldn't have been as fast, I guess, put it that way. I mean the development. So anyway, there I was back in the dean's office.

DOUGLASS: Did you want to be there?

ANDREWS: I rather enjoyed that year of being acting dean. But I think part of the enjoyment was knowing that it was only for a year. But it turned out that I rather liked the job and I thought, "Well, why not. Let's try it for a while."

DOUGLASS: What are some of the first things you remember about starting that position as acting dean?

ANDREWS: Well, I think the thing I remember most was getting the faculty allocations--the new positions--for the following year. Now, this was 1964. That was the time when universities all began to increase rapidly in size because that's when the post-war babies hit the colleges and universities.

DOUGLASS: This was the first year you were dean?

ANDREWS: Yes. That was a tremendous impact and the enrollments were growing like mad. Letters and Science had eighty new positions to fill. Now, that was a wonderful experience for me because previously Letters and Science hadn't gotten very many positions each year. And so I called department chairs and said, "Do you want a new position? How many would you like?" I gave them away like this with no advisory committees. I didn't know what I was

doing. But it was also true that at that time you didn't mess around because the competition for faculty was so great across the country that to get anything that was alive and walking you had to be out there recruiting early in the game.

DOUGLASS: How did you divvy up all those positions?

ANDREWS: It seemed such an awesome number I didn't run out; let's put it that way. I think the department chairmen were not yet fully apprised of the problem they were going to be facing in a year or two with all these students.

Well, anyway, I remember calling one chair and saying, "Would you like one or two new positions?" And he said, "Oh, no." He said, "The faculty would just get to fighting again about who to hire and, no, I don't want to go through that." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Do you remember which department that was?

ANDREWS: Yes. Psychology. And I thought, "Am I hearing correctly?" [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] So they didn't get any positions?

ANDREWS: I don't think so. No.

DOUGLASS: What else do you remember about trying to divvy up those positions?

ANDREWS: I remember that the recruiting proved to be very, very, very difficult.

DOUGLASS: Why was that?

ANDREWS: Because of the strong competition across the country, and, of course, we were not that well-established as a general campus. I'm afraid we got a lot of second or third besters, if you know what I mean.

DOUGLASS: What did you do to recruit people?

ANDREWS: Well, Herb in the infancy of the college used to go out himself all over the country and talk to people in different fields. I left it up, pretty much, to department chairmen. When I was a department chairman, I had gone on recruiting trips across the country. It wasn't so much the practice in those days to bring people in for interviews. We went out. I think in retrospect that was a mistake. You've really got to communicate with the people who are writing references, decide on the ones who are most reliable, take their word for it, and make up your list--a priority list--of people that you might like to hire. Then knock them down one by one and bring them in for interviews, see how they react to the campus, to the department, and how the department reacts to them. Have them give a seminar to allow faculty to say either, "That's a jerk," or "That's somebody I think we really ought to get."

DOUGLASS: But at that point you were going out and finding people as opposed to bringing them here?

ANDREWS: Well, departments were. Yes. Not entirely, but mostly I think.

DOUGLASS: What else stands out in those early years for you as dean?

ANDREWS: I should backtrack a minute.

DOUGLASS: Sure.

ANDREWS: Part of the reason for going out was it saved money. One trip rather than, say, five or something like that. Excuse me.

DOUGLASS: Do you have anything else to add about the recruitment? It sounds like that was your first really big activity.

ANDREWS: That was a big activity. We couldn't emphasize quality as much as I liked because we had to take what we got. That did not always work out very well, I regret to say. Sometimes it was fine. A lot of them, well, I think most of the people who were recruited at that time are probably retired or are about to retire because that was a long time ago.

DOUGLASS: But you had a high ratio that stayed with Letters and Science that you recruited at that point?

ANDREWS: I would say 80 percent. I'm guessing. We've lost some to other institutions. One of our fine historians went to Stanford [University]

which grieved me a lot I remember. But on the other hand, if you have people of that quality, it's nice to know that they are in demand in the right places.

DOUGLASS: Besides recruitment what other things stand out in your memory of what you did that initial period as dean?

ANDREWS: A lot of time was spent on budget, of course. Budget was a burning issue because of the rapid growth of the departments and the proliferation of departments. Some departments such as foreign languages, which was just one big department, finally split into three departments, three budgets to worry about rather than one. Budget took a lot of time. And, in fact, those are two of the major things that a dean deals with: budget, faculty recruitment, which is partially tied to budget of course, and also, I think, encouraging departments to pay attention to quality, both in undergraduate education and in faculty recruitment. You have to spend a lot of time with administration presenting your case for betterment of the college and that again is a largely a funding program, but also making sure that the top administration feels good about the college.

DOUGLASS: How did you work with the administration?

ANDREWS: Well, Emil Mrak had, of course, like all chancellors, a staff that

handled various aspects of the chancellor's job. I used to spend a lot of time with vice chancellor. . . . I don't know what they called it in those days, I'll say business and finance. He was the man with the money.

DOUGLASS: Who was that?

ANDREWS: His name was Mahlon Cook. And that's a sad story. He eventually was imprisoned for embezzlement, but he was good in his job. Like most people of his--I don't want to say stature--I mean people who had the jobs of his type in those days pretty much dealt out of their vest pocket. You went to them and pled your case if you needed something in the budget line, and if he felt so disposed, he would give you the money. There were others, but I remember him in particular because I dealt with him a lot. [Frank Edwin] Ed Spafford was sort of the chancellor's assistant. I'm not sure what Ed's job responsibility was in those days. I think he trouble-shot. He also tried to keep Emil and his secretary, Cynthia [Benevenga], from each other's throats.

DOUGLASS: Why do you say that?

ANDREWS: Well, they both liked combat. They use to yell at each other back and forth. Her office was next to his. I remember one day I went in

to Cynthia's office--I was on my way in to see Emil--and Cynthia was standing in the middle of the office kind of red-faced and Ed Spafford was holding onto her. And I said, "What's the matter?" And he said, "Emil told her he didn't know whether to fire her or strangle her." [Laughter] Of course, he did neither.

DOUGLASS: She stayed with him for quite some time despite the personalities?

ANDREWS: Yes. Her husband was a graduate student and he eventually left. I think he took a job at Wisconsin so Cynthia vanished from the scene.

DOUGLASS: What types of dealings would you have directly with Chancellor Mrak?

ANDREWS: I know I used to see him a lot. Usually, I think, it was to straighten him out on misimpressions, misinterpretations on his part. As I've said before, he was kind of a bombastic person, not the most suave in how he handled himself. His speeches were a riot because other people would write them and he couldn't read the words properly. I'm not downgrading him at all. He was a good chancellor, but he used to yell at me a lot, part of his gamesmanship as I might have indicated. I remember one day he called me on the phone and he said, "What have you done to this poor student in Letters and Science?" I said, "I don't know what you're talking about." I did not

handle student matters at all. I had an associate dean and his staff to take care of that and I didn't interfere with their business. But I said, "Is there anyone in your office Emil?" [Mrak said,] "No." And I said, "Well, I'll be right up." And when I got up there he was just like a pussycat. [Laughter] You know, it's fine on the phone, but . . .

DOUGLASS: But once you were face-to-face with him he didn't do that?

ANDREWS: Right. And I said, "Well, now tell me who the student is and what her problem is." And, he did. I went back to the associate dean and talked to him about it and then I called Emil and told him and he said, "OK."

DOUGLASS: In most administrative matters then you would work with somebody in his immediate staff . . .

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: . . . And then you would only really deal with him directly if there was a problem?

ANDREWS: We used to talk about the direction the college was going and things of that sort but on a. . . . Emil wasn't giving money away; he let other people do that. It was just generally keeping him aware of what I was doing, and his thoughts on what I ought to do and what

not to do, which was fine. I remember I set him back on his heals one time because he was away on some kind of a safari and Vernon Cheadle who was the chairman of botany and a friend of mine was appointed as acting [vice] chancellor [1961-62]. Vernon subsequently went to UC Santa Barbara as the chancellor. But at that particular time somebody--not me--had decided that the new science building which was in the offing should go to physics. At that time physics and chemistry were sharing facilities in the new part of Young Hall. The thought was they'd build a new building for physics, move physics out of the new part of Young Hall, and then let chemistry occupy that space. Well, that space was not, in the form that it was in in those days, adequate for chemistry because the laboratories were not wet laboratories. They didn't have sinks, running water, a lot of other things a chemist needs. I don't think they had hoods, I may be wrong. I had told Emil, "You know, I hate to say it, it sounds very territorial, but I think that building ought to go to chemistry." And he said, "Well, I'm so sorry." He said, "There's nothing I can do about it now; it's all in the works." Well, it wasn't in the works because no building plans had been drawn yet. It was still at the stage of getting money to do the job. So Emil

went away and then I went to Vernon Cheadle and I laid down the case before him for making a chemistry building rather than a physics building. He said, "That makes sense." He picked up the phone and he explained the situation to the vice president, Harry [Richard] Wellman. Harry said, "Fine. Build the chemistry building." Boom. When Emil got back one of the first things he said to me was, "I still feel bad about that physics building." I said, "Don't worry. It's all taken care of." He said, "It is?" [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] He didn't know, I take it.

ANDREWS: It was a sneaky trick, I guess.

DOUGLASS: But it worked.

ANDREWS: It worked. Physics got a new building not very long after--physics and geology--not very long after that. So everybody lived happily ever after. No big sweat. So that's the way it was in those days.

DOUGLASS: When you were dean, particularly focusing on that early period, what was the typical day like for you in your activities?

ANDREWS: Well, sometimes no planned agendas. There might be a meeting of department chairs scheduled in the afternoon. We used to have meetings oh, not too frequently because I don't believe department chairs should be saddled with going to meetings all the time. They

have enough to contend with in their own departments. But there were occasions when we had to get together and did. In the mornings usually we'd worry about budgetary matters. That was a constant concern even all during the year, department chairmen wanting more money for this and that and the other thing, and having to decide what priority lists were, and explaining to them very kindly why you couldn't get the money for them or explaining it on the phone usually. We had one department chairman that called me a Philadelphia lawyer because, "You can go talk to him [Andrews] and have a very nice time and he'll agree with everything you say and you won't get a damn dime . . ." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

ANDREWS: . . . And you'll leave the office feeling very happy."

DOUGLASS: How did you find out that that's what he called you?

ANDREWS: He told me. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Oh, he told you.

ANDREWS: That was [William V.] Bill O'Connor in English. He was one of my favorites, who unfortunately drank himself to death.

I think one of the fun things about being dean at the time I was, with all the growth of departments and new departments and

new programs and what not, was becoming aware of the disciplines other than the sciences. I mean more intimately aware. I began to take a really great interest in art and the work of the art department because it was such a good department. The real strength of that department was brought in before I became dean. Herb had made a good choice for department chairman and he had a nose for talent, get them while they're young and let them develop, and they did--like Wayne Thiebaud and [Robert] Bob Arneson and others. Well, anyway, I'm wandering off the subject.

DOUGLASS: What else did you enjoy about being dean?

ANDREWS: I think interrelationships with people. Watching people in their various capacities and watching how they operated, how they got what they wanted, how they reacted when they didn't get what they wanted, trying to avoid being yelled at by them when they didn't get what they wanted.

DOUGLASS: How did you avoid it?

ANDREWS: I didn't always. [Laughter] You don't win them all. But I don't remember very many instances of having outright battles with faculty members. I remember asking one faculty member please to leave my office before we were both sorry, and he did.

DOUGLASS: This was in the early period when you were dean?

ANDREWS: No, it was somewhere along the line but I don't remember when. You know, as you look back over that period--what did I say, twenty-one years--things all start to fuse together in your mind. You have a hard time sorting things out. I can remember the Mrak years and I can remember the [James H.] Meyer years and they were quite different, but it's a little hard to know exactly on all issues what happened when or did it really happen.

DOUGLASS: You just mentioned that the Mrak years were different from the Meyer years. How did they differ?

ANDREWS: I think because of difference in style of the two chancellors. Mrak was rather disorganized. It was his way of doing things, but there was no set pattern as to how things were going to run. Jim Meyer was much more methodical, I think on balance was more prone to consult with his deans than Emil was. I don't quite know how to explain it, but they were just two entirely different personalities, almost, I'd say, diametrically opposite each other. Because I'm sure you've seen how Jim Meyer operates. He's well-organized, he listens, he acts, not always like you'd want, but who wins them all? [Laughter] That's the way it is.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Session 2, October 6, 1992]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

DOUGLASS: I thought we could wrap up with some things that we talked about from the previous session and then progress on through the later years.

ANDREWS: Sure. That's fine.

DOUGLASS: When we talked during the last session you mentioned that when your position as acting dean ended and you returned to the chemistry department, you were happy to not be chair of the chemistry department. Why was that?

ANDREWS: Well, in many ways being a department chair is a more diverting life, that is taking away from the things that you really like to do in the lab and teaching, and giving you a lot of responsibility that you might not like to have. Although, of course, everyone takes his turn being chairman. You just figure it's part of the job and like it.

DOUGLASS: Not that long after that, then, you were asked to be dean when

Herbert Young stepped down. Why did you decide to accept the position of dean after some of the comments you've made about being acting dean and chair?

ANDREWS: I thought that there were things happening on the campus that were going to be very interesting--through the College of Letters and Science--and I thought maybe I'd like to be a part of it, that is from the administrative level. It never occurred to me that I'd be a part of it for so long as I was, but it was a period of a lot of change and was really very interesting. It did, of course, divert me away from a very active research career and from teaching.

DOUGLASS: You just said that there were things that were going to be happening that you were interested in. What were some of those things?

ANDREWS: The creation of new programs in particular and the building up of the faculty in size and in quality. At the time I became the dean we needed a lot of new positions. I may have mentioned this before.

DOUGLASS: Right. You did talk about that and that that was one of the first things you were involved in.

ANDREWS: Recruiting was very difficult because all the other collegiate institutions across the country were recruiting at the same time. Because the competition was so stiff it was not a totally satisfying

experience in some instances. We made mistakes and we knew we were going to, we just had to take a chance.

DOUGLASS: You mentioned that one of the main activities in your role as dean was to encourage departments on the quality of teaching and on recruitment. What did you do specifically to encourage them?

ANDREWS: You actually can't offer very many carrots to them except to say, "Get out and do the best you can; we want to make this a real top notch place." And most of them did. Some of them didn't take their recruiting efforts very seriously. That proved to be unfortunate in some instances. Others who did had some bitter experiences too, but also a great many successes.

DOUGLASS: When you say bitter experiences. . . .

ANDREWS: Well, getting people who really did not come up to the university standards and having to eventually let them go. And that's always a traumatic experience for both sides.

DOUGLASS: Right. Right.

ANDREWS: In some cases it led to law suits, not many fortunately.

DOUGLASS: But you did have some occasions where that happened.

Another thing that you said was an important activity was presenting your case basically for the betterment of the college to the

administration.

ANDREWS: That's right.

DOUGLASS: And I think you said that one experience you had with the physics building was an example of that?

ANDREWS: In that case I think it jarred physics, but the argument for building the building for chemistry first was, I felt, very, very strong, very compelling. I think in the long run it saved money since otherwise we would have had to refurbish Young Hall, that is, convert physics quarters into chemistry quarters, which would have involved a great deal of plumbing and furniture changing in the labs and in the long run we were going to get a new chemistry building anyway.

DOUGLASS: Are there some other examples that you can give where you were working in this capacity with the administration?

ANDREWS: In the matter of new buildings we did acquire a lot of new space. There was quite a bit of time expended in planning. I don't know how effective the dean's role was in the planning operation. Departments knew better than the dean what facilities they needed. The top level administration--the chancellor's office--knew better than the dean what the chances of getting funding and how much were. So the dean was sort of a go-between the departments and the top

level administration to do the best for the college that he could. That isn't only true of facilities, it's true of resources, money, new faculty positions.

I remember in particular with reference to new faculty positions, the first year I was dean we had an allocation of a huge number of new positions because of anticipated influx of students--the baby boomers you might say--which did indeed happen. In subsequent years, and that was after Jim Meyer became the chancellor, the college enrollment actually began to decline a little bit. It's hard to . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . This would be the early seventies that it started to decline?

ANDREWS: Yes. He became chancellor in 1969, as I recall, and it was a few years after he became the chancellor that the enthusiasm for Letters and Science on the part of entering students waned a little bit whereas agriculture began to boom a little bit. And, of course, we had a College of Engineering too, which was attracting students up to a point. As a result, the college actually lost some positions, not by eliminating people but by letting people eliminate themselves by retirement. Then the chancellor's office would pull those positions from the college and reallocate them. Now, I always felt very leery

about losing those positions because I knew that eventually we'd have to have them back and there would be a delay in getting new faculty on the scene to take care of the student load as it increased, and that's the way it worked out.

DOUGLASS: What did you think of that policy decision that Dr. Meyer made regarding positions? I know that he said that when he became chancellor he established the policy that faculty positions that were vacated by retirement went to him, and then those by resignation to the dean . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Yes . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . And then those by dismissal stayed with the department.

ANDREWS: That's right.

DOUGLASS: What did you think of that?

ANDREWS: Of course, he rightfully should have had some control, but I felt that in some instances it did the college a lot of harm because it removed positions for maybe a period of two or three years, and then, as I said, when we really needed them again they weren't there and we had to go out and recruit somebody. And we got them back eventually, and more, but . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . What did you have to do to get the positions again, for example?

ANDREWS: The enrollments had to be there as far as Jim Meyer was concerned. That's reasonable up to a point. As far as the dean was concerned, he'd have to manufacture a case with the help of department chairs, of course, that he felt would sell to the chancellor. That was based on a number of considerations, obviously departmental need because of work load, departmental need because faculty of that particular persuasion, whatever sub-discipline was at stake in the teaching program, there weren't any people who had those qualifications so we'd have to go out and get people who were. This was as programs began to broaden and develop, more courses were established.

DOUGLASS: Would you plead your case directly to Dr. Meyer or would you talk to someone on his staff?

ANDREWS: Usually it was a matter between the dean and the vice chancellor for academic affairs who worked very closely with the chancellor on position allocations as far as I remember.

Jim Meyer made a lot of his own decisions, though; I'll say that. He was his own man. He was a very fair man. There was never any element of deceit in anything he did. It was all out and above board. He was very methodical. He didn't act precipitously. He thought a lot about what he did and he did what he thought was

right.

DOUGLASS: You made the comment when talking about the differences between Dr. Meyer and Dr. Mrak in terms of their roles as chancellor that Dr. Meyer did have those qualities as the chancellor of being well-organized and methodical, that he listened and he acted, and that sometimes you didn't always agree with what . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Right . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . His decisions were, but that was the way he functioned. Can you think of any examples of decisions that he made that you didn't agree with specifically?

ANDREWS: I can't recall any major disagreement except how I felt about losing faculty positions which I just said. I know we didn't agree all the time and it was always all out and open for both of us. We weren't hiding anything from each other. I remember one time he said to me, "Well, I guess we're just going to have to agree to disagree." [Laughter] And that was that.

DOUGLASS: But you can't think of any specific situations?

ANDREWS: No. I think if I could it would be because it stuck in my mind because I was so annoyed and I . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . And there isn't anything that . . .

ANDREWS: . . . No.

DOUGLASS: You said, too, just to retrace the years when Dr. Mrak was chancellor, that he had this tendency to be disorganized and a bit bombastic, but then once you talked to him face-to-face he tended to back down. You said that despite some of those qualities he was a good chancellor. Why do you think he was a good chancellor?

ANDREWS: I think he had the best interests of the campus at heart. In spite of all this bombastic element in his character, a lot of that was just horseplay on his part. He just wanted to see what he could get away with. He was a bit of a surprise as a chancellor. I think a lot of people didn't seriously consider him as a likely possibility. He was a kind of a dark horse when the time came to appoint a new chancellor, I mean when he was appointed.

DOUGLASS: People were surprised?

ANDREWS: A lot of people were surprised. I wasn't. I could see that there was some handwriting on the wall and I wasn't unhappy about it. Every so often he'd get me down with all his noise making, but I finally got to the point where I understood it and it didn't bother me anymore. But I remember one time I got very upset with something he said or did and I called him at home and said, "I think I'm just going to have

to quit." And he said, "Oh, come off it." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] And then what did you say?

ANDREWS: OK.

DOUGLASS: Obviously you didn't quit.

ANDREWS: No. No. [Laughter] Not for a long, long, long time. Too long. Well, it's just interesting the difference in style between the two chancellors and you can survive very well.

DOUGLASS: What did you think of Dr. Meyer's style of management?

ANDREWS: I had known Jim, of course, before because he was dean of agriculture at one time and it was fine with me. You pretty much knew where you were going. Because as I said there was no horseplay. It was all out in the open. I can live with that very nicely. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] You felt that his being open allowed you to do what you needed to do and not worry so much about trying to convince him perhaps of what you were doing, your legitimacy, or. . . .

ANDREWS: Well, he did have his hang-ups. He could be stubborn at times as we all can and he had certain beliefs that I did not agree with.

DOUGLASS: What were those?

ANDREWS: For example, at one time--I won't name the department--but he said

to me, "Well, I think we're just going to have to make up our minds sometimes that we can't build every department into a center of excellence, so we'll just let this one survive and not try to push it along." Well, I feel that you should never neglect any department when it comes to trying to improve its status, its quality, and this was a quality issue. [Jim said,] we were just going to have to make up our mind we were going to have second raters in the faculty in that department. He changed.

DOUGLASS: In that particular situation?

ANDREWS: Yes. Well, gradually, not dramatically. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] Do you remember when that was? Was that in the early part of his tenure?

ANDREWS: It probably was. I don't recall.

DOUGLASS: What did you think about the fall conferences that he initiated?

ANDREWS: Oh, I usually went kicking and screaming but they were in some respects good. I don't think they were as good as all the effort that went into them took but I think there were other people who went that didn't feel the same way I did. The personnel and attendees of those conferences changed every year because he would invite entirely different groups of faculty from what he did the year before,

but the administrators went to all of them. So after a while you begin to think, "Well, really what happened at this conference." But I think the faculty who attended enjoyed because they heard about things they might not have heard about before and got a little special attention from the chancellor and a pat on the back is always welcome.

DOUGLASS: You just made the comment that you went kicking and screaming. [Laughter]

ANDREWS: Yes. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Why did you say that?

ANDREWS: I just don't care about things like that very much.

DOUGLASS: You mean that conference type atmosphere . . .

ANDREWS: . . . No . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . With a lot of people?

ANDREWS: Right. And, I didn't think a lot of the speakers were worth listening to.

DOUGLASS: Who would the speakers be?

ANDREWS: Usually members of the faculty who had some particular interest in whatever subject was under discussion. The conferences changed their themes every year. I don't recall in particular any special one

theme but different groups of subjects all related to the themes in question were discussed every year. There were main speakers, small group sessions, discussions of what the speakers had to say--mostly boring--but. . . .

DOUGLASS: Is there anything you think you got out of it specifically?

ANDREWS: I met some faculty I hadn't met before which I think is all to the good.

DOUGLASS: Do you mean in other colleges specifically?

ANDREWS: Yes. Oh, I knew a very large majority of the people in Letters and Science, not intimately, some of them, God knows, I wouldn't have wanted to know intimately. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

ANDREWS: But I also had a lot of friends, particularly in the ranks of department chairs and ex-chairs.

DOUGLASS: During those early years when Dr. Meyer first became chancellor was when a lot of the student activism was going on. I know that was one thing he had to deal with almost immediately as he moved from being dean to chancellor designate and then chancellor, and of course some things were going on when Dr. Meyer was chancellor.

ANDREWS: That's right.

DOUGLASS: How did student activism impact Letters and Science?

ANDREWS: I don't recall that it had any direct impact on the college. Student activism was usually--on the campus--was usually directed at the chancellor's office which put the chancellor in the position of being a fall guy for something he had no influence over whatsoever.

I think I may have mentioned to you in some earlier conversation that when Jim was the chancellor designate--I think it was in May of 1969--the students, not just here but across the country, became very much aroused about what was going on in Cambodia. And Jim had three thousand students out here in front of Mrak Hall--in front of the steps--at lunchtime one day. This was when he was the chancellor designate and he had to calm them down by giving a talk. I said to him, because I was standing close by him before he started to talk, I said, "Well, where's Emil? Why isn't he doing this?" He said, "He's gone into the woodwork." So, he talked and he was very nice to the students. He said, "I am with you." And what he meant was, "I am concerned just as you are." Well, dear Governor [Ronald] Reagan interpreted that to mean that he was one of the rioters. Now, these kids were not rioting. They were quite peaceful. They just marched over here in a body and wanted to

hear what the chancellor thought about the whole thing. I think he was sincere. I didn't see anything wrong with it myself but when dear governor heard about it, of course he was a member of the board of regents, he tried to get rid of Jim Meyer. Well, he didn't. He turned his attention to Clark Kerr and got rid of him which was a tragic mistake too. But I'd better not continue on Governor Reagan. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] He did have an influence on what happened in terms of budget and some other things so it is relevant . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Yes. Well, . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . To hear your observations in terms of what was happening on the campus at the time.

ANDREWS: You mean of the governor?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

ANDREWS: Oh, yes. My feeling was that in the years he was governor he did a lot of psychological damage to the university. He was very critical of it. He got rid of Clark Kerr because he felt Clark Kerr could have kept the lid on when things went sour at Berkeley. That was a pretty rough scene back in, I think it was the year that I became dean, 1964. I remember particularly because Mrak was the chancellor at

that time and my daughter had just entered Berkeley as a freshman. He said, "How can you let your daughter be down there in that den of iniquity?" And I said, "It was her choice, not mine." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] You just said that he [Governor Reagan] had a devastating psychological impact on the campus.

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: How else do you think that affected . . .

ANDREWS: I can't give you any other specific instances, but that whole thing got Reagan off on the wrong track. I had the feeling he was taking pot shots at the university the whole eight years he was governor.

DOUGLASS: Did his comments about Dr. Meyer rally support on this campus for him?

ANDREWS: I don't recall any big outcry because I don't think faculty at large were too much aware of what Reagan had said. I think it upset Jim Meyer terribly because he felt insecure, didn't quite know where he stood. But Jim's a tough guy, he can hack that.

DOUGLASS: Do you have any other observations about student activism and what happened on the campus?

ANDREWS: Well, I remember one time that there was a policy on the campus for a period that we could only hire a person as an associate-in, which is

a name for a person who teaches part-time, probably not much above the level of a teaching assistant in what she or he does. We had one woman who had served in that capacity for the maximum complement of years so I told the department, "Well, you can't rehire her." Well, for about a week there was a rally of female students outside my office carrying banners "Down with Dean Andrews" [Laughter] and so on and so on. But I used to walk through them in the morning. They didn't know who I was. I'd walk through their crowd in the morning and wave at them and say, "Hello," and they'd say, "Hi."

DOUGLASS: They didn't know you were the dean?

ANDREWS: No. They finally went away. And the administration backed down and said, "Go ahead and hire her again."

DOUGLASS: I'm sorry. What was the problem again with her specifically about her hiring?

ANDREWS: You could only hold that appointment, at least according to policy at that time, for a certain number of semesters and she had served that many semesters.

DOUGLASS: But she wasn't going to be promoted to a regular position?

ANDREWS: No, that was not an issue. I think maybe subsequently she was made

a lecturer, probably with security of employment which is sort of like tenure. For a period she was serving as an assistant dean in the dean's office after I left. There was no animus between us. So it goes.

DOUGLASS: Were there any other things that happened that directly impacted Letters and Science?

ANDREWS: In the way of student activism?

DOUGLASS: Yes. In the way of student activism.

ANDREWS: Well, yes. I remember some of the Black students got aroused over what they felt was lack of support for the Black Studies program. I think this was at the time when the Black Studies program was teetering on the brink of becoming a reality or not. Were we going to have such a program or not. And I think I had a visitation of about thirty Black students in the dean's office one day to get my views on the subject. I was, in a sense, supportive of the program. I had misgivings about setting one up because no discipline had been created yet. It didn't exist. So they were going to build from scratch. As I predicted, unfortunately young Black faculty who were hired into the program to teach in it but had no real experience in anything of that sort didn't make it on the academic ladder.

DOUGLASS: You mean they had no experience teaching or . . .

ANDREWS: Research particularly, and probably no experience teaching in the discipline as such because it was being created, it was new. And that's an awfully hard assignment to hand to a new faculty member.

DOUGLASS: What did you tell the Black students that came to your office?

ANDREWS: I don't remember now. They went away. Well, they came with this sort of chip on their shoulders and they went away, I think, with sort of chips on their shoulders, but I didn't see them again. I think I probably told them that we're doing the best we can right now and giving the matter our consideration. There are a number of issues that have to be dealt with, position funding for one. And they accepted that. They didn't particularly like it. One day I was up in the chancellor's office and I saw a whole body of Black students marching up the mall. And I said, "Oh my God. Where are they going?" Lorena Herrig, who was the chancellor's right hand and assistant, said, "Oh, that's the chancellor's 1:30 [P.M.] appointment." So, I got the hell out of there. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: You didn't want to be involved?

ANDREWS: No.

DOUGLASS: How did the Black Studies program get initiated?

ANDREWS: I don't recall any of the particular details but it was not only Black Studies, we had . . .

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

DOUGLASS: You were talking about how Black Studies and Chicano Studies got started.

ANDREWS: Yes. There was more at issue then. The Asians wanted an Asian American major. In fact, they wanted it in the College of Letters and Science and I remember being visited one day by a delegation of Asian American students with one student as the leader of the expedition. And when they came into the office I held out my hand to shake it--or to shake his--and he turned his back on me. They were out of that office in one minute and they marched upstairs to the College of Agriculture and created the major program there.

DOUGLASS: Why do you think that happened?

ANDREWS: Because I wasn't putting up with any of their nonsense. They got the message fast that if they were going to do anything, we would do it calmly, thoughtfully, not in an atmosphere of outright belligerence. So that's where [College of Agriculture] the program was located for a long time. I think now it's back in Letters and Science if I'm not

mistaken. There was one other program of that nature but I just don't recall what it is right now.

DOUGLASS: Yes. Right.

ANDREWS: Oh, I know, Native American Studies.

DOUGLASS: Right. Right.

ANDREWS: And that also went to agriculture.

DOUGLASS; Why was that?

ANDREWS: I'm not quite sure. I've forgotten the history of that one.

DOUGLASS: But these programs were all basically developing at about the same time . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Yes . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . Which is in the early seventies.

ANDREWS: Yes. And they all have their ups and downs. We burned up a lot of faculty members in the process which I always felt bad about.

DOUGLASS: Were these new people that came here?

ANDREWS: Yes. We had one excellent person in Mexican American Studies. He was a history professor who was a Mexican American.[1]

DOUGLASS: Who was that? Do you remember his name?

ANDREWS: No, I don't. He left. He was, I think, a full professor. But he left to

---

[1]Jose R. Juarez, Professor of History.

take a job heading up a community college in, I think, Laredo [Texas]. And I tried to do everything but stand on my head to keep him here but he felt he had a commitment to go back to his home territory and do something positive for his people. Under those circumstances you could only say, "Well, good luck. I don't want you to go." And that was a darn shame because he was a person who could have helped to build the discipline. He had a scholarly background already established in his field which was Mexican History, I think, if I recall correctly. He had something that most of these faculty in these new programs like that didn't have. Anyway, I may be wrong but I think probably the program that has done the best at least during my period as dean was the Mexican American Studies program. And I think a lot of it had to do with this particular faculty member.

DOUGLASS: In terms of student activism, obviously things were changing on the campus. Considering the fact that you had been here a long time, what changes did you see in the students?

ANDREWS: Of course, during the days of the student riots, the mid-to-late-sixties and early seventies, the students were interested in saving the world from its ills. They weren't what I would call career-oriented.

DOUGLASS: When did you start noticing this?

ANDREWS: It was about the time when the student riots began. It was right after I became dean.

DOUGLASS: OK. So '65 or mid-sixties.

ANDREWS: Yes. And the sociology major was extremely popular in those days. That all changed eventually and students got very career-oriented. All of a sudden they wanted to make money.

DOUGLASS: When did you notice that?

ANDREWS: I think it became very obvious in the eighties. Probably the mid-seventies to the mid-eighties, I would guess. The sociology major declined in enrollment precipitously, very interesting. You can tell by the students' choice of majors fairly well, that is by looking at gross numbers of students in those majors, as to what's motivating them.

DOUGLASS: What did you learn from that situation?

ANDREWS: Only that all of a sudden the students had a different perspective from what they did in previous years. You know, it is very difficult to predict over any long period of time what student interest in the major is going to be. It changes. It will go in one direction for maybe five years. Then one major will be popular for five years and

then its enrollment will plummet. Another one will go up in enrollment for a few years and then its enrollment may get static, whereas student interest may shift back to the major which was popular in the past.

DOUGLASS: How did that affect your program development or academic planning?

ANDREWS: It's very difficult but that's why I used to. . . . I know Jim Meyer used to talk about doing long-range planning. Well, that's all well and good and one can make a case for it, but when it comes to academic programs you're tied to student interest. You don't tell the students what majors they should choose. They choose them and they tell you. And so the dean is going a little bit bonkers in trying to decide where to put resources in programs because he doesn't know what's down the road in terms of popularity of that program a few years hence.

DOUGLASS: When you talk about programs are you talking about mostly undergraduate or graduate programs too?

ANDREWS: The dean, while he has to fund the graduate programs which are taught within his departments, those by and large don't require large allocations of money because the faculty are on the scene, they teach

graduate courses in their field of specialization and like it. They like to teach at the graduate level as a rule. So the graduate program is not a big motivating factor when it comes to budget allocations.

DOUGLASS: So most of your focus was on what was going on with undergraduate programs?

ANDREWS: Right. Now some majors, you know, are always going to take a lot of funds and faculty positions, like chemistry for example, because it's required by so many major programs. All biological sciences students have to take chemistry, the engineers have to take chemistry, and the chemists and physicists have to take it. At least, I guess, the physicists take it. I think they should. And the geologists. So you have a captive audience.

DOUGLASS: You talked some about what stands out in your mind in terms of things that happened to you more in the early years as dean, but when you look back, thinking about the whole time you were dean, what stands out in your memory of that time?

ANDREWS: You mean some particular thing?

DOUGLASS: Yes. Is there something that is foremost in memory about that experience?

ANDREWS: I don't see any one thing that I felt was more worth remembering

than any other. I don't think. . . . There are some things I would rather forget.

DOUGLASS: Would you talk about some of those things that you said you would rather forget?

ANDREWS: Oh, just having to do with unpleasant faculty mostly. Fortunately there weren't very many of them but there were enough to get me riled once and awhile.

DOUGLASS: It bothered you personally to . . .

ANDREWS: Not so much. It bothered me that people could behave the way some of them did. I used to say faculty are just children who got big. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

ANDREWS: Those were in the days when I was disillusioned.

DOUGLASS: When was that?

ANDREWS: Oh, months at a time I think. [Laughter] I learned a long time ago that I should never take my troubles home with me; it doesn't do any good. So, when I left the office, that was that.

DOUGLASS: Were there any other things that you would rather not remember?

ANDREWS: No, I wouldn't say so. Generally I enjoyed the faculty. I enjoyed the students although I didn't see much of the students because

students who came into the dean's office were shunted to the associate deans in charge of student affairs. I taught for quite a while after I was dean until it got too much for me when the college got big.

DOUGLASS: How long did you teach?

ANDREWS: I think, well I was in the dean's office for twenty-one years; I quit teaching about eight years before I gave up the job, so, about thirteen years, I guess.

DOUGLASS: That's a long time.

ANDREWS: It was just one course a year but I kind of felt I wanted to keep my hand in it. Unfortunately in that eight year period when I didn't teach I lost touch with the subject matter more than I would have anticipated and getting back into teaching after I left the dean's office was very hard.

DOUGLASS: Do you think being out of touch in that way had a negative impact on your role as dean?

ANDREWS: No. No, I don't think so. Chemistry used to feel I was out of touch with the department because they didn't always get out of me what they wanted in the way of resources and money, but it's funny I really never had that reaction from any of the other departments that

I recall.

DOUGLASS: Just chemistry.

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: That's interesting.

ANDREWS: Yes. Sure it was.

DOUGLASS: This may tie into the same thing but you said in the previous session that some of the things you liked about being dean were being exposed to other disciplines, the interrelationships. Were there any things that you particularly disliked about it?

ANDREWS: I remember having to administer certain programs that I didn't feel comfortable administrating.

DOUGLASS: Which programs were those?

ANDREWS: I think for a while I had the responsibility of overseeing intercollegiate athletics and I'm the least athletically inclined dean in the whole country, I think--or was. Fortunately they finally put it under the vice chancellor for student affairs office, any place to get it out from under me as far as I was concerned.

That was the only one that gave me any real trouble. One that I thought I might not enjoy was the ROTC [Reserve Officers' Training Corps] program which was part of the college, or

administered by the college. But, in fact, except for having one particular colonel who was heading up the program for a while to deal with, my association with the program was always very pleasant. We had some wonderful, wonderful colonels like Orrin Tracy and Max [V.] Kirkbride. They were topnotch people. Tracy died, incidentally, but Kirkbride I still hear from at Christmas, very fine fellow. Most of those colonels who headed up the program retired right after they got out of the program. They [the United States Army] didn't keep them on the scene for very long, a few years at a time and then they'd either reassign them or they'd retire.

DOUGLASS: Are there any other things that you can think of that you disliked about the role?

ANDREWS: No. I can't recall anything that was particularly bothersome. I thought I might have trouble with the P.E. [Physical Education] program but I didn't. They had trouble within the department itself because there were at times a lot of friction between the coaching staff and the academic faculty. [There was] a lot of looking over the fence to see who was getting more salary and that sort of thing. I used to have visitations from disgruntled department members from time to time to tell me what a bunch of clucks all the others were.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] What did you do to deal with the situation?

ANDREWS: I just listened calmly and sweetly and didn't do anything.

DOUGLASS: Just let them air their . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Yes . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . Troubles.

ANDREWS: That's all they really wanted.

DOUGLASS: To talk about Dr. Meyer and his role as chancellor, during the time you were dean is there anything in particular that stands out in your memory?

ANDREWS: I think the thing I remember most is the period he. . . . What he went through when his wife was dying. He had to keep right on performing and it must have been extremely difficult. He did tell me that at one time during that period he had considered seriously resigning, which was. . . .

DOUGLASS: Now this would be about 1977?

ANDREWS: I don't remember when Margaret [Hickman Meyer] died.

DOUGLASS: It was the late seventies.

ANDREWS: Was it?

DOUGLASS: Was this a personal conversation you had with him that he told you

this?

ANDREWS: Yes. I think that conversation took place after she died. I don't remember. But I could have understood completely why he would have, if he had resigned. But he bore up somehow.

DOUGLASS: Do you think that it directly impacted his abilities or have any affect, positive or negative?

ANDREWS: Not visibly. Just you could tell he was under strain. But he can keep his thoughts to himself pretty well if he wants to. And, of course, subsequently he remarried and then his second wife died. I think it was about the same thing that Margaret died of. Mary [Regan] died of a brain tumor, cancer I believe. He's married again to an old friend from early days from Idaho.

DOUGLASS: He had quite a bit of personal tragedy he was dealing with.

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Are there any other things that stand out in terms of how he functioned as an administrator perhaps during his chancellorship?

ANDREWS: No. Mrak used to visit departments frequently, "Larry, I want to meet with such and such department." "OK." Jim tried to do that but I think it got too much for him.

DOUGLASS: Because of the growth of the campus?

ANDREWS: Yes. Too many programs, but he learned a lot in those visits. I remember that he met with geology one time and they put on a dazzling show. I mean it was absolutely a riot. Each one gave a little talk about his research, showed slides, pictures, whatnot. It was slick. I mean it couldn't have been done better.

DOUGLASS: This was the early seventies he was doing this?

ANDREWS: Yes. I think that's about right. Maybe a little later.

Afterwards he said, "God, that's a good department." [Laughter] I remember, though, one of the faculty was talking about volcanic eruptions and he kept talking about magma. Well, when this fellow finished speaking, Jim said, "Well, thank you very much, now I know what magnum is all about." I said, "Jim, it's magma." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

ANDREWS: That was one very funny day I remember. I was so pleased and amused.

DOUGLASS: You were here during both Dr. Mrak and Dr. Meyer's times as chancellor and I know you talked about how they were different administrators. How do you think Dr. Meyer was as a chancellor?

ANDREWS: Oh, fine. I had the impression that [University of California

President] David [Pierpont] Gardner didn't think that Jim was flossy enough in his administrative style. That's a funny thing to say, but I think he wanted someone who he felt was a real go-getter. Well, Jim was a go-getter but in his own quiet way. So, the go-getter they brought in was [Chancellor Theodore L.] Hullar and I won't say anything more.

DOUGLASS: OK.

ANDREWS: [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: I want to talk more about you again because the focus is your time as dean. Why did you decide to step down as dean?

ANDREWS: What really focused my attention on the fact that I was getting tired of it--maybe getting tired is what I should say--was when Jim said to me, "Well, you know it's time for you to have your seven-year review," because they reviewed deans every seven years. They have secret committees who solicit letters from the faculty at large, write reports to the chancellor, and so on. And I said, "I don't want to go through that again." I said, "I'll serve one more year and then I'm quitting." And he said, "OK." That was that. I had never had any trouble with my previous reviews but I meant it; I just didn't want to prolong the agony. And I never regretted it.

DOUGLASS: Making the decision?

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Now earlier you made a comment that you never expected to be dean for so long and then you said, "Too long."

ANDREWS: [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Did you feel that it was longer than perhaps you really wanted to be dean?

ANDREWS: Well, not necessarily. I knew I'd been dean for an unusually long time. I did enjoy the job. I enjoyed working with all the department chairmen. We sort of operated like a big team. [I] remember the chancellor said, "Well, you're just the chair of the chairs." And I said, "Well, OK, that's fine." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter]

ANDREWS: But that part I liked very much. But it just begins to get a little annoying to find yourself going through this. . . . There's kind of a pattern in your activities as dean. You do the same things at the same time every year: fight for new positions, allocate new positions, fight for budget, allocate budget. Now some of the deans hire executive associate deans to do all that and I think they sit around and think beautiful thoughts, which doesn't do the campus much

good. That's my own hang-up. But I just thought enough is enough. I also, as I told Jim at the time, "I think it's time for new blood in here." Change is good. I don't think you should change deans too often, but I think you ought to keep them as long as they're doing satisfactory jobs. But I think there's some merit in keeping them for a while because it takes a while to get to know the job and to do it effectively, I think. And you learn by making mistakes. Once you made those mistakes you remember not to do them again or make them again. You know, I just was ready I think. And I was sincere when I said I thought it was time for new blood.

DOUGLASS: When you retired you returned to teaching, is that correct?

ANDREWS: They gave me a year off on administrative leave with dean's salary which I thought was very nice of them, and then I went back to teach for a year and a half and retired. I retired when I was sixty-seven and that had been my intention all along. When I came here it was mandatory I think. You had to retire, maybe it was by sixty-five when I first came here. Subsequently it was sixty-seven. Then it went to seventy. I wasn't having any of that. I don't know where it stands now. Whether it's still seventy or whether they've taken the lid off completely.

DOUGLASS: It's in the stages of being changed again I know.

ANDREWS: Yes. While some people can teach effectively until they're a hundred probably, I don't think most people continue to be effective after they get past a certain age. I can't put my finger on that age but I think it's nice to have a ceiling on retirement age. Again, I think, you need to keep new blood coming in. What makes it possible is when people retire.

DOUGLASS: Are there any things in summary or that we haven't covered about the time that you were dean that you would like to bring up?

ANDREWS: Another thing that I remember particularly is I didn't just get to know faculty, I got to know staff, the people who do all the hard work in the departments, the secretaries, and in the science department, the lab personnel. That is, people who supply the stock that goes into the student laboratories, the storeroom keepers and the technicians, the glassblower, the this, the that, the other thing. It's different in each department as to how they're structured because of the differences in the disciplines, with the humanities and the social sciences having much fewer staff than the science departments. I would say the math department doesn't have a large staff. P.E. does because of the nature of their operation with gyms and whatnot to

back up.

DOUGLASS: How did you get to know them?

ANDREWS: Talking to them on the phone. Talking with them when I visited the departments, which I did quite a bit.

DOUGLASS: This was part of your routine?

ANDREWS: There was no fixed routine but very often instead of having a department chairman come to see me I'd go to see them--him or her as the case may be. I had talked to staff over the phone and so then when they'd come in the office sometimes they'd come in to talk to me. Just over a period of years I got to know them. I enjoyed that because in many ways I could find out what was going on in the departments from them more than I could from the chairman. [Laughter] I didn't treat them as spies, don't mistake me. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] But you felt it was important to get their observations?

ANDREWS: Oh, sure.

DOUGLASS: That they were critical in the functioning of the department?

ANDREWS: Well, I think it's important to make them feel that they're a needed part of the organization because they are. Unfortunately there have been some instances where they've gotten too much authority. I remember in particular--I don't know whether I mentioned this before

or not--but there was when I became dean a foreign language department which had representation from Spanish, French, German, Russian--I guess those were the languages that were represented--and it was chaired at that time by a member of the French department who was so research oriented that he simply turned over the responsibility for running the department to the administrative assistant or whatever. I don't remember her job title at that time. And she was a very strong-minded woman who took the place over and ran it. I remember one faculty member who came to complain to me one time, said he went in to get a box of paper clips and she said, "What do you need that for?" That's how bad it was. Now I don't fault her so much as the department chairman because he in effect either by telling her directly . . .

[End Tape 2, Side B]]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

DOUGLASS: Go ahead and finish the story.

ANDREWS: Well, all I was going to say is that she went, he went, and the department broke up into three pieces at that time. We had three departments instead of one. He didn't leave immediately but he eventually took a job elsewhere. He was a very decent sort but he

was just a damn fool. And she was OK too but too strong-willed to be put in that position.

DOUGLASS: You felt that as an administrative assistant that wasn't her role to be doing that?

ANDREWS: No. Something similar happened later on in another unit. There's no sense in going into it. But that just gives you an idea of the funny things you run into and how the number of departments in the college got bigger and bigger. That was one thing that we did was to keep splitting [departments]. History and political science used to be together as one department and then they split. As the enrollments get big [it] just becomes less feasible to package all these different disciplines in one unit.

DOUGLASS: I would like to finish up with any further topics you would like to cover.

ANDREWS: Yes. I don't have very much to say. One thing I noticed on the sheet of things [Andrews is looking at the preliminary interview outline] that we might talk about was. . . . I forget which item it was but it brought some things to mind.

DOUGLASS: We didn't talk about general education. Is that one?

ANDREWS: No. I don't have much to say about general education. I believe in

it. I felt cheated as a chemistry major at Berkeley in not having an opportunity to have more breadth in the subject matter that I chose. But how artificially to create a general education program I've never been sure. What it always boils down to is the selection of a group of courses coming from different disciplines which can be chosen to satisfy the general education requirements. And that's pretty arbitrary in a way. I think there a lot of courses that could be included that aren't for one sticky reason or another. I perhaps might like to see students given a little more freedom in what they could choose from. Students shouldn't have to be all pounded into the same mold, God knows, even when it comes to a general education program. That, of course, is a danger if the requirements are too specific so that only very few courses satisfy the requirements. So, I don't know. As I say I'm all for it but I've never been sure how to do it just right. I don't know that our program is totally satisfactory.

DOUGLASS: You worked on that in the seventies?

ANDREWS: I personally never did much with it. It was done by the faculty. Leon Mayhew who was vice chancellor for academic affairs played a very instrumental role. The individual colleges did not except by whatever faculty they had representing them on the planning

committees. So it was not a program that impacted the dean's office at all.

DOUGLASS: Was there something else on that sheet that . . .

ANDREWS: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Go ahead and take a look at it.

ANDREWS: [Andrews is looking at the preliminary interview outline] Well, it says major achievements while dean. I don't know that I had any major impact on any one thing but my style was such that I worked with departments and programs to help them build. They were providing the ideas and if I liked the idea I'd support it. I think the things that stand out most in my mind are the development of the integrated studies program, which is a lower division program with faculty rotating from year to year and groups of faculty--say five or six--come together from different disciplines and teach a series of courses which intermesh in theme. It's surprising how diverse the disciplines that are represented from year to year are: physics, philosophy, music. Somehow they have this ability--the groups of faculty who work in the program--to create a unified theme for the two-year program that the students are following. And the number of students that enroll in the program is somewhat limited. I never

thought it would survive as long as it has.

DOUGLASS: When did it start?

ANDREWS: I think sometime in the seventies.

DOUGLASS: And where did that idea come from? Was that your idea?

ANDREWS: No. No. It's one that I. . . . I felt my function as the dean was to serve as the catalyst. I find it very difficult to move into disciplines or sub-disciplines of which I don't have any expertise and say, "You're going to do it this way or that way." I wouldn't dare to do it in chemistry anyway. I'd get batted down by my colleagues. They're not afraid of me. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] So your style of management, like you said, was to work with people and gather information . . .

ANDREWS: . . . Right . . .

DOUGLASS: . . . And then champion what you thought was a good cause.

ANDREWS: Yes. And then another thing that comes to mind is the proliferation of growth--fantastic growth--of the inter-departmental programs, things like international relations which was one of the most popular majors in the college and has no departmental structure whatsoever but draws on faculty from different departments to teach the courses required for the major: history, econ, political science. It's quite

impressive. There are a large number of such programs at the college, I think about forty, whereas the departmental majors are substantially lower in number, I think twenty, at one time there were twenty-six I believe, departmental majors. Now admittedly some of the inter-departmental programs don't draw large enrollments. The Black Studies, or the Afro-American Studies, Asian American Studies and so forth are in the program. The one problem with those programs, but it's not too serious, is just how effectively to administer them because there's no handle like you have in the form of a formally structured department with a lot of space assigned to it. So it creates a few problems but they're not insurmountable.

DOUGLASS: Was that the problem with getting programs like African American Studies started in the first place?

ANDREWS: Yes. How do you provide an economic base for the program. Usually it means hiring a secretary or something of that sort who functions as a lone wolf in many cases.

DOUGLASS: Regarding those two specific programs, Asian American Studies and Black Studies, they began at a time when affirmative action and the Equal Opportunity Program were coming into effect, and students were making noises about what they felt was representation of their

culture. How much legitimacy do you think that those students had at that time in terms of demanding a program?

ANDREWS: I think it was not so much that they felt the need to have such programs personally. It was a question of status. They wanted their particular racial group somehow to be represented in the curriculum. Now I sound as if I'm saying that maybe it's not a good idea to have such programs. I'm not saying that. I said before that it was difficult to build them effectively because there was no discipline previously established. And that's been I think the thing that has, more than anything else, delayed the structuring of those programs. They don't draw large numbers of students, very few majors. Some of the courses probably have quite a reasonable student representation. A number of white students choose to take them. And I'm not saying that they're not useful programs but, as I say, there just are not many majors in the programs [Inaudible].

DOUGLASS: I know this is an issue. It is like the chicken or the egg in terms of not having a discipline, but if you don't do something then how do you develop a discipline.

ANDREWS: Yes. To develop it we had to put aside a certain number of faculty positions and say that's where they're going to go. But then there

was nobody really on the scene except people in existing departments who could carry on the recruitments necessary to fill the faculty slots. And very often the faculty who were given that assignment didn't know how to do it either. It was tough. And it may still be tough for all I know.

DOUGLASS: Do you think that is why choices that were made in terms of bringing people in to run the programs, like Chicano Studies and Black Studies as they were called at that time, was difficult? Because they didn't have a basis by which. . . .

ANDREWS: Yes. Very difficult. The faculty who came in--young faculty--didn't really know how to create the discipline. Of course, they were supposed to publish in their field but they didn't know what to publish. What they did publish very often was looked down on with dismay by the faculty who were on committees to review them for advancement.

DOUGLASS: Those faculty didn't consider what they were reviewing met the academic standards?

ANDREWS: That's right. "This paper is a bunch of junk; has no depth." It was probably true but God knows these young people were trying hard. I think in many ways they had an impossible assignment.

DOUGLASS: I asked you about how those programs were initiated. Was pressure from the students the reason why those programs were started?

ANDREWS: And pressure from the faculty.

DOUGLASS: So it was both.

ANDREWS: Yes. There were Black faculty on the campus. There were Native Americans on the campus. And certainly there were Mexican Americans and Asian Americans. They were all represented. All those racial groups were represented in existing faculty. Those faculty along with students, maybe those faculty were pushed by the students, I don't know, were all advocating the formation of programs of this kind. And so it all came to be.

DOUGLASS: Were there any controversies in particular that occurred that you haven't brought up that stand out?

ANDREWS: I don't recall any particularly troublesome situations, no. There were some but I've talked about those.

DOUGLASS: Right.

ANDREWS: Nothing else comes to mind in particular.

DOUGLASS: One thing we really did not talk about was affirmative action. I realize a lot of that was policy sent down basically from the administrative level, but how did that impact your office?

ANDREWS: We hired staff to promote the affirmative action program. That is, Jim encouraged departments to hire more women and minority representation from minority groups. And a great deal of progress was made I think. I was quite sympathetic to the program. Some problems, as you know, have come out of pushing the program too hard almost, for example the [Allan] Bakke case in the medical school. I remember going to one meeting of arts and sciences deans someplace in the East and the Bakke case was raging at that time. It was all over the newspapers all over the country. And I was asked in one of these deans' meetings, "Well, how do you feel about the Bakke case and what its doing to your campus?" And I said, "Any publicity is good publicity." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] You weren't troubled by what happened?

ANDREWS: Interested. No, I thought the medical school was very brave to put itself in the position of being a shining example of what was either right or wrong. It had never been tested. Nobody quite knew how far you should go. And they went all the way and got slapped down for it. I don't think it bothered them very much.

DOUGLASS: Do you think it mostly had a positive impact within the College of Letters and Science in terms of recruiting for the faculty and the

staff?

ANDREWS: I frankly doubt if it had much impact on Letters and Science. I think people in Letters and Science were perfectly willing to pursue the objectives of an affirmative action program. At least, I never came across any outright antipathy. It probably existed here and there, but no, I don't think it caused us any problems, none that I recall particularly.

DOUGLASS: Is there anything you want to add in summary, anything we haven't talked about you think we should mention?

ANDREWS: I'll probably think about a million things after we quit. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] That can happen. That's perfectly reasonable.

I did want to go over the main things, one of which was student unrest. You gave a couple of examples but there was not a lot of direct impact upon the College of Letters and Science that you can remember.

ANDREWS: Well, there was one thing I don't think I mentioned that we had some trouble with, the ROTC program.

DOUGLASS: We should talk about ROTC.

ANDREWS: At the time of all the student unrest there was a great deal of resentment on the part of some students about the existence of an

ROTC program on the campus. We had a wonderful colonel at that time, I mentioned his name before, Max Kirkbride, who walked back into the ROTC headquarters in the gym one day to find himself in the middle of a student sit-in.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember when this was?

ANDREWS: Well, it was sometime in the mid-sixties I think.

DOUGLASS: It was before Dr. Meyer was chancellor?

ANDREWS: It was probably mid-to-late-sixties.

DOUGLASS: OK.

ANDREWS: So the colonel went down the line--they were sitting on the floor in the hallway--and he shook hands with each student and then he had them serve coffee and then he passed out enlistment forms.

DOUGLASS: How did the students react to that?

ANDREWS: I don't know. [Laughter] By five o'clock that evening there was only one student left sitting there, and the colonel said, "Well, we're all going to go home now and we're going to lock up for the evening and you won't be able to get out." [The student said,] "Oh, that's all right." So the whole staff walked out and they padlocked the door and that was that. And they went back about five minutes later and opened up again and said, "Do you want to come out now." "Yes,

sir." [Laughter] Well, at some time during that troublesome period a group of students lined up while cadets were marching on the field where they did their drill and spit on them. And the colonel came to me later and he said, "You know," he said, "I was able to hold the lid on this time but if it happens again I can't guarantee anything." Well, it didn't happen again.

DOUGLASS: Did you do anything specifically in response to that?

ANDREWS: No, I didn't do anything. Someone threw a Molotov cocktail at the building--the wall of the building--where they were housed during that time but that's about as far as it went.

DOUGLASS: Did you do anything specific to try to deal with these situations or in anticipation of anything happening?

ANDREWS: No, not really. It would be hard to know what the students attention was going to be five minutes from now even. One day they might be crusading about this, the next day about something else. You just couldn't anticipate what.

DOUGLASS: How did you feel about what the students were doing?

ANDREWS: I thought it was awful. I don't mind peaceful demonstrations but I wondered what useful purpose they were having here on the campus. I do remember one night a group of students went down and sat on

the railroad tracks to prevent the passage of a train that was carrying munitions. And a number of the students were arrested and one was--maybe I told you this--Glenn [T.] Seaborg's son?

DOUGLASS: No, you didn't mention that.

ANDREWS: And Glenn thought that was hilariously funny. I would have been mad but he took it in good grace.

DOUGLASS: Who was Glenn Seaborg?

ANDREWS: A Nobel Prize winner in chemistry at Berkeley.[1] He's quite a big name. But he just thought it was funny. Well, I figured if he thought it was funny I couldn't get too upset. As a parent I would have been pretty unhappy. Actually in spite of the fact that students marched around a lot, the campus was very peaceful. We had no Kent State [University] problems; we had no Berkeley problems.

DOUGLASS: Why do you think that was?

ANDREWS: I don't know. I could never really put my finger on it.

DOUGLASS: There's something about the atmosphere of Davis?

ANDREWS: It may well be just that, the small-town atmosphere, the folksiness of the campus, which isn't so folksy any more, but there's still a lot of feeling of spirit here that you don't see on some of the other

---

[1]Glenn T. Seaborg was chancellor of UCB from 1958 -1961.

campuses.

DOUGLASS: Is there anything else you want to add about student activism or ROTC?

ANDREWS: No, I don't think so.

DOUGLASS: OK. We talked about Dr. Meyer's leadership and administrative approach. Is there anything you want to add about that?

ANDREWS: No, only that I found that serving under him as dean was a very pleasant experience by and large. I enjoyed it. He put up with me.

DOUGLASS: Why do you say that? Is there anything in particular that you were thinking of?

ANDREWS: No. We used to have weekly luncheons of the deans over in the Faculty Club, no fixed agenda.

DOUGLASS: What did you think of that?

ANDREWS: I liked it. It was nice to get to know all the other deans, find out what was going on around the rest of the campus besides my little bailiwick. I made some very good friends among those deans, some not so good. I was particularly fond of the law school dean, Florian Bartosic. I don't know whether you ever run into him or not?

DOUGLASS: No, not so far.

ANDREWS: Well, he's not the dean any more but he was a very, very pleasant

man. He was attorney to the teamsters union, worked with [James R.] Jimmy Hoffa. Very interesting person to know.

DOUGLASS: Were there any other things that Dr. Meyer implemented in terms of policy or activities like meeting for these luncheons that stands out to you that you liked, or disliked even?

ANDREWS: I can't remember anything particular. As I said, I did like those luncheon meetings. I think the current chancellor has turned them into business meetings which I personally think is a mistake. I think when you sit down to eat lunch you should eat lunch and have a good time.

DOUGLASS: The informality of the situation, you felt, was beneficial?

ANDREWS: Yes. From time to time things would come up that we'd talk about but they were not planning sessions or. . . . We had formal deans' meetings at the conference room in Mrak Hall every so often but those were very structured.

DOUGLASS: We touched on curriculum expansion although we didn't really talk about that specifically. Basically I would assume curriculum expansion occurred within the departments. Did you have much interaction in terms of that?

ANDREWS: Well, mainly you see academic programs, the structures of the

program and so forth, are really handled by the academic senate. The dean doesn't play any major role in curriculum structure. But if the curriculum is added, that usually means more resources have to be put into the program. And that's where the dean comes in. So in that sense, yes, I did play a role but not in shaping the program internally.

DOUGLASS: OK.

ANDREWS: That just about has to be left to departments and the overseeing is done by the Academic Senate.

DOUGLASS: One last thing that I wanted to get your impression of is the issue of growth which I know you said in the sixties you saw positively in terms of how you liked the breadth and what was happening with the students and the department.

ANDREWS: Right.

DOUGLASS: What are your observations about the impact of growth later on through the seventies and the eighties?

ANDREWS: Well, I had no objection to growth. I think there's some merit in not having too large an enrollment on a campus. I think the students tend to get more personal attention that way from the faculty. But, on the other hand, one has to face the facts that California's gotten to

be a big, big state. So, we're going to have to have large enrollments whether we like it or not, and build new campuses.

DOUGLASS: Did you see any specific impact on the College of Letters and Science in the seventies . . .

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

DOUGLASS: So you didn't feel that it was necessarily negative or positive, you just saw it as a natural progression?

ANDREWS: Right. No, I had no problem with it. It's to be expected. It was a surprise to me that it all happened that we got so big because at one time in the early days when I was here it was taken for granted that the campus would never have an enrollment of more than five thousand students. But that idea vanished very early in the game.

DOUGLASS: Why do you think Davis became so popular?

ANDREWS: Well, part of it goes back to the sixties when student activism was so rife on the Berkeley campus and a lot of parents said, "To hell with Berkeley, I'm going to send my kids to Davis." And the kids went to Davis and went back home and said, "It's great," so more people came. On the other hand, a lot of the students who go to Berkeley wouldn't think of going to Davis. It's just a question of how you're

oriented whether you like a small-town campus or big-city campus.

DOUGLASS: Do you think there were any other reasons why Davis grew, or was that the main one?

ANDREWS: I think it had a lot to do with it but of course, as I've said before, we got our big allocation of positions--I think it was eighty new positions--for the college in 1964 which was when I became dean and student activism became rampant. A lot of it had to do with the baby-boom and the fact that some of the big campuses--Berkeley and UCLA--couldn't grow to unlimited size. Students began being diverted to Davis and that, coupled with the impact of student activism on parental attitudes about where their kids should go, had a big effect on the size of the campus.

DOUGLASS: You said the growth of the campus was a surprise in terms of the fact that people expected it to be at around five thousand?

ANDREWS: Yes. It was a surprise because that was, at one period, just taken for granted.

DOUGLASS: Were there any other surprises that you experienced in your time here?

ANDREWS: No. I think after a while it became apparent to me that in the academic world nothing should surprise you. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: [Laughter] Expect the unexpected?

ANDREWS: Right.

DOUGLASS: There's nothing specific you can think of now that surprised you at the time, that you were not expecting?

ANDREWS: Well, some of the antics of the faculty [Laughter] [Inaudible].

DOUGLASS: The personalities, right?

ANDREWS: The funny messes they got themselves into. I could tell you some of them but I won't on tape. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: You won't tell me any? Would you give me one example?

ANDREWS: Unfortunately the one that always is foremost in my mind involves people who are too much on the scene at this time.

DOUGLASS: OK. That's fair. I thought I'd try though.

ANDREWS: [Laughter] I'll tell you when the tape is off.

DOUGLASS: OK. Is there anything else you can think of? Take a minute to think. You don't have to respond immediately.

ANDREWS: No. No, I don't think so.

DOUGLASS: Do you think we've just about covered everything?

ANDREWS: Yes. Only thing I can say at the end is I never regretted coming here.

DOUGLASS: That's a nice thing to say. That's important.

ANDREWS: Yes. I don't know how many faculty feel that way but I would guess quite a large number.

DOUGLASS: Great. Well, thank you Dr. Andrews.

ANDREWS: Thank you.

DOUGLASS: I enjoyed it.

ANDREWS: Pleasure.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following serves to elaborate on a source used to verify names referenced in the interview.

California. Secretary of State. California Roster 1990. California Office of State Printing, 1990.

Hoffa, James R. The Trials of Jimmy Hoffa: An Autobiography. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1970.

Mrak, Emil M. "A Journey Through Three Epochs: Food Prophet; Creative Chancellor: Senior Statesman of Science." Oral History Interview. Conducted 1974 by A. I. Dickman, Oral History Program, University Library, University of California, Davis.

Stadtman, Verne A., ed. The Centennial Record of the University of California. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Printing Department, 1967.

NAMES LIST

Oral History Program
Center for California Studies
California State University, Sacramento

Interviewee/Narrator Lawrence J. Andrews

List Compiler/Interviewer Susan E. Douglass

NAME	IDENTIFICATION	VERIFICATION	PAGE SOURCE
Elizabeth Heggelund Andrews	Wife	Andrews	2
Herbert A. Young	Dean, College of Letters and Science	Stadtman	2
Richard E. Kepner	Professor, Chemistry	UC Officers & Students Sec. 1, 12/44	5
Raymond M. Keefer	Professor, Chemistry	Stadtman	6
Dinsmoor Webb	Assistant Professor, Enology	UC Directory, January 1951	8
Agnes Rudser Ring	Secretary, Chemistry	Andrews	17
Emil Mrak	Chancellor	Stadtman	19
Stanley B. Freeborn	Provost	Stadtman	20
Claude B. Hutchison	Dean, College of Agriculture	Stadtman	20
Mahlon Cook	Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs	Stadtman	26

Frank Edwin Spafford	Assistant Chancellor, Physical Construction and Maintenance	UC Directory, 1970-1971	26
Cynthia Benevenga	Secretary, Chancellor Mrak	Mrak	26
Vernon Cheadle	Professor, Botany Acting Vice Chancellor	Stadtman	29
Harry Richard Wellman	Vice President, UC	Stadtman	30
William V. O'Connor	Professor, English	UC Directory, 1964-1965	31
Wayne Thiebaud	Professor, Art & Art History	UCD, 1991-1992 Directory	32
Robert Arneson	Professor, Art & Art History	UCD, 1991-1992 Directory	32
James H. Meyer	Chancellor	UCD, 1991-1992 Directory	33
Ronald Reagan	Governor	California Roster, 1990	48
Clark Kerr	President, UC	Stadtman	49
Lorena Herrig	Executive Assistant, Chancellor Meyer	UCD, Public Information Office	53
Orrin Tracy	Colonel Professor, Military Science	Stadtman	63

Max V. Kirkbride	Colonel Professor, Military Science	UC Directory, 1969-1970	63
Margaret Hickman Meyer	Wife, Chancellor Meyer	Meyer	64
Mary Regan	Wife, Chancellor Meyer	Meyer	65
David Pierpont Gardner	President, UC	UC Directory, 1985-1986	67
Theodore L. Hullar	Chancellor	UCD, 1991-1992 Directory	67
Leon Mayhew	Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs	UCD, 1991-1992 Directory	74
Allan Bakke		Chancellor's Papers	81
Glenn T. Seaborg	Chancellor, UCB	Stadtman	85
Florian Bartosic	Dean, Law School	UC Directory, 1984-1985	86
James R. Hoffa	President, Teamsters Union	Hoffa	86

CAL-NA BINDERY
1930 28th St.
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 452-4355